



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,785	06/14/2001	Michael Tucker	PA1932	1613
29855 7:	590 12/15/2004	·	EXAMINER	
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,			VAUGHN JR, WILLIAM C	
P.C. 20333 SH 249	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 600			2143	
HOUSTON, T	X 77070		DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A II 41 N -	Annlingst(s)	
e e	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
Office Action Supercond	09/881,785	TUCKER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William C. Vaughn, Jr.	2143	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	ss
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt is will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te. cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this comm ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 i	November 2002.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			•
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		~ *	,
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	• •	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ier.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2001 is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obje	cted to by the Examiner.	. •
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			~
		` 440(a) (d) a= (f)	,
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	in priority under 35 U.S.C. §) 119(a)-(a) or (1).	. ,
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eta hava baka raasiyad		
1. Certified copies of the priority documer		national No	
2. Certified copies of the priority documer			200
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	-	received in this National Sta	age
application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		recoived	
See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies flot	received.	
	=		- *
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview 9	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0	B) 5) ∐ Notice of I 6) ☐ Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-15)2)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in regards to the most recent papers received on 25 November 2002.

Information Disclosure Statement

- 2. The references listed on the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 25 November 2002, have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).
- 3. The application has been examined. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 4. Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Broussard et al. (Broussard), U.S. Patent No. 6,317,776.
- 5. Regarding claim 1, Broussard discloses a system, comprising: a videoconferencing unit that creates data in a format appropriate for real time transport [see Broussard, Col. 4, lines 57-63] a processor [see item 30] that receives the data and reassembles the data into a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems [see Broussard, Col. 6, lines 14-35]. By this rationale claim 1 is rejected.
- 6. Regarding claim 2, Broussard discloses wherein the data is compressed [see Broussard, Col. 5, lines 8-9]. By this rationale claim 2 is rejected.
- 7. Regarding claim 5, Broussard discloses wherein the reassembled data is stored on a server (Broussard teaches packetized received data over the network that is received

Art Unit: 2143

from the terminal), [see Broussard, Col. 4, lines 33-43]. By this rationale **claim 5** is rejected.

- 8. Claim 6 list all the same elements of claim 1 but in processor form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 1.
- 9. Claim 7 list all the same elements of claim 1 but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 1.
- 10. Regarding claim 8, Broussard discloses wherein the step of reassembling the data into a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems is accomplished through the steps of: determining whether a frame of data appropriate for a real time transport protocol contains audio or video data [see Broussard, Col. 5, lines 1-8]; buffering audio data when a frame of data contains audio data [see Broussard, Col. 6, lines 14-35]; buffering video data when a frame of data contains video data [see Broussard, Col. 6, lines 13-25]; creating data in a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems that includes the buffered audio data [see Broussard, Col. 6, lines 15-35]; determining whether data in a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems should include the buffered video data [see Broussard, Col. 6, lines 15-35]; and creating data in a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems that includes the buffered video data if it is determined that the buffered video data should be included [see Broussard, Col. 6, lines 35-45]. By this rationale claim 8 is rejected.

Art Unit: 2143

- 11. Regarding claim 9, Broussard discloses wherein the data is compressed [see Broussard, Col. 5, lines 8-9]. By this rationale claim 9 is rejected.
- 12. Regarding **claim 10**, discloses wherein the data is compressed [see Broussard, Col. 5, lines 8-9]. By this rationale **claim 10** is rejected.
- 13. Regarding claim 14, discloses further comprising the steps of causing the reassembled data to be stored on a server (Broussard teaches packetized received data over the network that is received from the terminal), [see Broussard, Col. 4, lines 33-43]. By this rationale claim 14 is rejected.
- 14. Regarding claim 15, discloses further comprising the steps of causing the reassembled data to be stored on a server (Broussard teaches packetized received data over the network that is received from the terminal), [see Broussard, Col. 4, lines 33-43]. By this rationale claim 15 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 16. Claims 3, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard in view of Mizoguchi, U.S PG PUB 2002/0054215.
- 17. Regarding claim 3, Broussard discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Broussard does not explicitly disclose wherein the data is compressed with H.263.

Art Unit: 2143

18. In the same field of endeavor, Mizoguchi discloses (e.g., image transmission apparatus transmitting image corresponding to terminal). Mizoguchi discloses wherein the data is compressed with H.263 format [see Mizoguchi, section 0041].

- 19. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Mizoguchi's teachings of an image transmission apparatus transmitting image corresponding to terminal with the teachings of Broussard, for the purpose of preventing an increase in network traffic as well as an increase load on the transmission apparatus [see Mizoguchi, section 0010]. By this rationale **claim 3** is rejected.
- 20. Regarding claim 11, Broussard-Mizoguchi further discloses wherein the data is compressed with H.263 format [see Mizoguchi, section 0041]. By this rationale claim 11 is rejected.
- 21. Regarding claim 12, Broussard-Mizoguchi further discloses wherein the data is compressed with H.263 format [see Mizoguchi, section 0041]. By this rationale claim 12 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 22. Claims 4, 16, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard in view of Walters et al. (Walters), U.S. PG PUB 2001/0052019.
- 23. Regarding **claim 4**, Broussard discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Benslimane does not explicitly disclose wherein the reassembled data can be delivered as an email attachment.

Art Unit: 2143

24. In the same field of endeavor, Walters discloses (e.g., video mail delivery system). Walters Broussard discloses wherein the reassembled data can be delivered as an email attachment [see Walters, abstract, sections 0002, 0014, 0015, 0024 and 0025].

- 25. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Walters' teachings of video mail delivery system with the teachings of Broussard, for the purpose of By this rationale claim 4 is rejected.
- 26. Regarding claim 16, Broussard-Walters further discloses further comprising the step of creating an e-mail that includes a hyperlink to the reassembled data stored on the server [see Walters, abstract, sections 0002, 0014, 0015, 0024 and 0025]. By this rationale claim 16 is rejected.
- 27. Regarding claim 17, Broussard-Walters further discloses further comprising the step of creating an e-mail that includes a hyperlink to the reassembled data stored on the server [see Walters, abstract, sections 0002, 0014, 0015, 0024 and 0025]. By this rationale claim 17 is rejected.
- 28. Regarding claim 18, Broussard-Walters further discloses further comprising the step of creating an e-mail that includes the reassembled data as an attachment [see Walters, abstract, sections 0002, 0014, 0015, 0024 and 0025]. By this rationale claim 18 is rejected.
- 29. Regarding claim 19, Broussard-Walters further discloses further comprising the step of creating an e-mail that includes the reassembled data as an attachment [see Walters, abstract, sections 0002, 0014, 0015, 0024 and 0025]. By this rationale claim 19 is rejected.

Art Unit: 2143

30. Regarding claim 20, discloses wherein the data received in a format appropriate for a real time transport protocol is generated in response to a failed attempt at a videoconference [Walters, section 0032]. By this rationale claim 20 is rejected. Regarding claim 21, Walters discloses wherein the data received in a format appropriate for a real time transport protocol is generated in response to a failed attempt at a videoconference [Walters, section 0032]. By this rationale claim 21 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 31. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broussard-Mizoguchi as applied to claim 7, 8 and 12 above, and further in view of Goodwin, III, U.S. Patent No. 6,532,232.
- 32. Regarding **claim 13**, Broussard discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Broussard-Mizoguchi does not explicitly disclose further comprising the step of creating data in a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems that includes an empty video frame command if it is determined that buffered data should not be included.
- 33. In the same field of endeavor, Goodwin discloses (e.g., method and system for transporting audio/video data over a bus). Goodwin further comprising the step of creating data in a format appropriate for standard media on computer systems that includes an empty video frame command if it is determined that buffered video data should not be included [see Goodwin, Col. 9, lines 63-67 and Col. 10, lines 1-8].
- 34. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Goodwin's teachings of a method and system for transporting audio/video over a bus with the

Art Unit: 2143

teachings of Broussard-Mizoguchi, for the purpose of providing a system and method for efficiently transmitting data packets without significant processor utilization [see Goodwin, Col. 4, lines 7-10]. By this rationale **claim 13** is rejected.

Conclusion

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Vaughn, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3922. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-6:00, 1st and 2nd Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

William C. Vaughn, . Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2143

WCV

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).